

David L. Sobel (*pro hac vice*)
sobel@eff.org
ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION
1875 Connecticut Ave. NW
Suite 650
Washington, DC 20009
Telephone: (202) 797-9009 x104
Facsimile: (202) 707-9066

Kurt Opsahl (SBN 191303)
kurt@eff.org
Marcia Hofmann (SBN 250087)
marcia@eff.org
ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION
454 Shotwell Street
San Francisco, CA 94110
Telephone: (415) 436-9333 x116
Facsimile: (415) 436-9993

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION,)	NO. 3:07-CV-5278-SI
)	
Plaintiff,)	REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF
)	MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
v.)	INJUNCTION
)	
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL)	Judge: The Hon. Susan Illston
INTELLIGENCE,)	Date: November 30, 2007
)	Time: 9:00 a.m.
Defendant.)	Courtroom: Courtroom 10, 19th Floor
)	
)	
)	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
I. THE COURTS HAVE CONSISTENTLY RECOGNIZED THAT PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIONS ARE APPROPRIATE IN FOIA CASES.....	1
II. ODNI’S DELAY IN PROCESSING EFF’S “EXPEDITED” FOIA REQUESTS VIOLATES THE STATUTE	4
III. EFF WILL SUFFER IRREPARABLE INJURY IN THE ABSENCE OF PRELIMINARY RELIEF	8
CONCLUSION	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>ACLU v. Dep't of Defense</i> , 339 F.Supp.2d 501 (S.D.N.Y. 2004)	3
<i>ACLU v. Dep't of Justice</i> , 321 F.Supp.2d 24 (D.D.C. 2004)	8, 10
<i>Aguilera v. FBI</i> , 941 F.Supp. 144 (D.D.C. 1996)	1, 3
<i>Al-Fayed v. CIA</i> , 2000 WL 34342564 (D.D.C. 2000)	3
<i>Assassination Archives & Research Ctr. v. CIA</i> , 1988 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18606 (D.D.C. Sept. 29, 1988)	3
<i>Cleaver v. Kelley</i> , 427 F.Supp. 80 (D.D.C. 1976)	1, 3
<i>Electronic Frontier Foundation v. Dep't of Justice</i> , slip op., 06-CV-1773 (RBW) (D.D.C. Sept. 27, 2007)	4
<i>Electronic Privacy Information Center v. Dep't of Justice ("EPIC")</i> , 416 F.Supp.2d 30 (D.D.C. 2006)	passim
<i>Exner v. Federal Bureau of Investigation</i> , 542 F.2d 1121 (9th Cir. 1976)	5
<i>Fiduccia v. Dep't of Justice</i> , 185 F.3d 1035 (9th Cir. 1999)	7, 10
<i>Gerstein v. CIA</i> , No. C-06-4643 MMC, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 89847 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 29, 2006) ...	8, 9
<i>Gilmore v. National Sec. Agency</i> , No. C-92-3646 THE, 1993 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7694 (N.D. Cal. May 3, 1993)	5, 7
<i>Judicial Watch v. U.S. Dep't of Justice</i> , slip op., No. 00-1396 (D.D.C., June 27, 2000)	3, 4
<i>Leadership Conference on Civil Rights v. Gonzales</i> , 404 F.Supp.2d 246 (D.D.C. 2005)	8, 9
<i>Natural Resources Defense Council v. Department of Energy</i> , 191 F. Supp. 2d 41 (D.D.C. 2002)	10
<i>Open America v. Watergate Special Prosecution Force</i> , 547 F.2d 605 (D.C. Cir. 1976)	4, 5, 7
<i>Payne Enterprises v. United States</i> , 837 F.2d 486 (D.C. Cir. 1988)	4
<i>Renegotiation Bd. v. Bannerkraft Clothing Co.</i> , 415 U.S. 1 (1974)	4

Statutes

5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i)	4
5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(C)(i)	4
5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(II)	2

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Electronic Frontier Foundation (“EFF”) initiated this action on October 17, 2007, and moved for entry of a preliminary injunction on October 29, 2007, seeking an order requiring Defendant Office of the Director of National Intelligence (“ODNI”) to disclose information relevant to a pending and time-sensitive Congressional debate within ten days.

ODNI filed an opposition on November 9, 2007; the agency opposes the motion on the grounds that 1) a preliminary injunction is not an appropriate vehicle for the relief EFF seeks; 2) the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”) does not mandate any specific time frame for the processing of an “expedited” request; and 3) no harm will result if the agency is permitted to process the documents on its own schedule, without the Court’s intervention. EFF respectfully submits this reply to address those contentions.

I. The Courts have Consistently Recognized that Preliminary Injunctions are Appropriate in FOIA Cases

Defendant ODNI incorrectly asserts that motions for preliminary relief in FOIA cases are “generally inappropriate” and that “[a] number of courts have denied requests for preliminary injunctive relief for claims brought under the FOIA” Defendant’s Opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction (“Def. Opp.”) at 7-8. To the contrary, federal courts have long entertained and, when appropriate, granted requests for preliminary relief in FOIA cases. For instance, in *Cleaver v. Kelley*, 427 F.Supp. 80 (D.D.C. 1976), the court issued a preliminary injunction requiring, within 21 days, the production of all documents responsive to a FOIA request and the filing of an index detailing and justifying any withholdings. The injunction was predicated upon the court’s finding of an “exceptional and urgent need” for disclosure of the requested information. *Id.* at 81-82. Likewise, in *Aguilera v. FBI*, 941 F.Supp. 144 (D.D.C. 1996), the court granted plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction and ordered the agency to “comply with plaintiff’s FOIA requests” and file a *Vaughn* index within 30 days. As in *Cleaver*, the injunction was based upon a finding of “exceptional and urgent need” for disclosure. *Id.* at 152.¹

¹ Both *Cleaver* and *Aguilera* were decided before Congress enacted the 1996 FOIA amendments and created the statutory right to expedited processing at issue in this case. In *American Civil Liberties Union v. DOD*, 339 F.Supp.2d 501, 503 (S.D.N.Y. 2004), decided subsequent to those

1 The most comprehensive consideration of preliminary relief in circumstances similar to
 2 those present here was in *Electronic Privacy Information Center v. Dep't of Justice* (“EPIC”), 416
 3 F.Supp.2d 30 (D.D.C. 2006), a case that Defendant cannot overcome simply by describing as
 4 “arguably erroneous[],” Def. Opp. at 7 n.4, and “wrongly decided,” *id.* at 14. Indeed, the
 5 government is attempting to relitigate the *EPIC* case here, regurgitating the precise arguments that
 6 were considered – and rejected – by the district court in the District of Columbia less than two
 7 years ago.²

8 In *EPIC*, the Justice Department administratively granted a request for expedited FOIA
 9 processing upon a finding that, *inter alia*, the request satisfied the same statutory standard at issue
 10 in this case – the request concerned a matter about which there is an “urgency to inform the public
 11 about an actual or alleged Federal Government activity,” and was made by “a person primarily
 12 engaged in disseminating information.” *EPIC*, 416 F.Supp.2d at 34 (quoting 5 U.S.C.
 13 § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(II)). As in this case, despite its decision to grant “expedited processing,” the
 14 agency had “neither completed the processing of EPIC’s FOIA requests nor informed EPIC of an
 15 anticipated date for the completion of the processing” and the requester moved for a preliminary
 16 injunction. *Id.* at 34-35. In an argument that ODNI repeats *verbatim* in this case, DOJ
 17 “question[ed] the propriety of EPIC seeking preliminary injunctive relief,” and “accuse[d] EPIC of
 18 using the motion for a preliminary injunction, which according to the DOJ seeks ‘a version of the
 19 ultimate relief’ in the case, as a litigation tactic ‘to artificially accelerate the proceedings in this
 20 case.’” *Id.* at 35; *see also* Def. Opp. at 2-3 (EFF attempts “to artificially accelerate the proceedings
 21 in this case” and motion seeks “a version of ultimate relief”).

22 Citing the same settled authority that EFF relies upon here, the court rejected the
 23

24 amendments, the court noted that it had previously heard “argument on plaintiffs’ preliminary
 25 injunction motion,” rejected the government’s argument that the processing issue was moot
 26 because the defendant agencies were responding “as soon as practicable,” and “held that
 jurisdiction was proper.”

27 ² This Court last year relied upon the *EPIC* decision, and quoted it approvingly, in *Gerstein v. CIA*,
 28 No. C-06-4643 MMC, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 89883 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 29, 2006) (“*Gerstein I*”),
 where the Court granted a “motion to compel” the processing of a FOIA request within 30 days.

1 government's argument:

2 DOJ's argument that EPIC acts improperly in seeking a preliminary injunction is
 3 unavailing. On numerous occasions, federal courts have entertained motions for a
 4 preliminary injunction in FOIA cases and, when appropriate, have granted such
 5 motions. *See ACLU v. Dep't of Defense*, 339 F.Supp.2d 501, 503 (S.D.N.Y. 2004)
 6 (granting preliminary injunction motion in FOIA case and requiring production
 7 within one month); *Aguilera v. FBI*, 941 F.Supp. 144, 152-53 (D.D.C. 1996)
 8 (granting preliminary injunction in FOIA case and requiring expedited processing to
 9 be completed within approximately one month); *Cleaver v. Kelley*, 427 F.Supp. 80,
 10 81-82 (D.D.C. 1976) (granting preliminary injunction in FOIA case and requiring
 11 expedited processing to be completed within approximately twenty days); *see also*
 12 *Al-Fayed v. CIA*, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21476, at *19-20 (D.D.C. Sept. 20, 2000)
 13 (denying preliminary injunction in FOIA case after conducting four-part analysis);
 14 *Assassination Archives & Research Ctr. v. CIA*, 1988 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18606, at
 15 *1-3 (D.D.C. Sept. 29, 1988) (same).

16 *EPIC*, 416 F.Supp.2d at 35 (footnote omitted).³

17 Even in those cases where applications for preliminary injunctions seeking expedited
 18 processing of FOIA requests were *denied*, the courts have never suggested, as Defendant implies,
 19 that such relief is somehow improper. ODNI cites several cases in which reviewing courts merely
 20 determined that the specific facts before them did not warrant expedited processing. Def. Opp. at
 21 7, n.4; *see, e.g., Assassination Archives and Research Ctr. v. CIA*, No. 88-2600, 1988 U.S. Dist.
 22 LEXIS 18606 (D.D.C., Sept. 29, 1988) (denying preliminary injunction motion after conducting
 23 four-part analysis); *Al-Fayed v. CIA*, 2000 WL 34342564 (D.D.C. 2000) (same).⁴ In *Judicial*
 24 *Watch v. U.S. Dep't of Justice*, slip op., No. 00-1396 (D.D.C., June 27, 2000), the plaintiff "did not
 25

26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000

1 make . . . a request” for expedited processing under the statutory standard at issue here. *Id.* at 2. In
 2 any event, the court recognized that “Congress wished to reserve the role of the courts for . . .
 3 occasions . . . when plaintiff can show a genuine need and reason for urgency in gaining access to
 4 Government records” *Id.* at 1, quoting *Open America v. Watergate Special Prosecution*
 5 *Force*, 547 F.2d 605, 615-616 (D.C. Cir. 1976) (internal quotation marks omitted).

6 Finally, ODNI cites the recent decision in *Electronic Frontier Foundation v. Dep’t of*
 7 *Justice*, slip op., 06-CV-1773 (RBW) (D.D.C. Sept. 27, 2007) (attached to Def. Opp. as Exhibit 3)
 8 in support of its suggestion that preliminary relief is somehow inappropriate. Def. Opp. at 8. In
 9 fact, the court followed *EPIC*, conducted a preliminary injunction analysis, and concluded that “the
 10 agency has effectively rebutted the presumption of delay by providing a detailed explanation as to
 11 why the time period prescribed by the FOIA could not be met,” as required by *EPIC*. *See* slip op.
 12 at 5.

13 While ODNI suggests that the range of judicial remedies in FOIA cases is somehow
 14 limited, there is no such restriction. As the D.C. Circuit has noted, “[t]he FOIA imposes no limits
 15 on courts’ equitable powers in enforcing its terms.” *Payne Enterprises v. United States*, 837 F.2d
 16 486, 494 (D.C. Cir. 1988), citing *Renegotiation Bd. v. Bannercraft Clothing Co.*, 415 U.S. 1, 19-20
 17 (1974). “[U]nreasonable delays in disclosing non-exempt documents violate the intent and purpose
 18 of the FOIA, and the courts have a duty to prevent [such] abuses.” *Id.*, 837 F.2d at 494 (citation
 19 omitted). An exercise of that duty is all that EFF requests here.

20 **II. ODNI’s Delay in Processing EFF’s “Expedited” FOIA Requests Violates the Statute**

21 The government mistakenly asserts that the FOIA “does not require agencies to process
 22 expedited requests within a specific time limit.” Def. Opp. at 9-10. Such a conclusion would
 23 require the Court to ignore both the plain language of the statute and the manner in which it has
 24 been construed for more than 30 years.

25 ODNI reads the expedited processing provision of the statute in isolation, divorcing it from
 26 the generally-applicable 20-day processing time limit contained in 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i), and
 27 the provisions of 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(C)(i), which states:
 28

Any person making a request to any agency for records . . . shall be deemed to have exhausted his administrative remedies with respect to such request if the agency fails to comply with the applicable time limit provisions of this paragraph. If the Government can show exceptional circumstances exist and that the agency is exercising due diligence in responding to the request, *the court may retain jurisdiction and allow the agency additional time* to complete its review of the records.

(emphasis added). In *Open America*, 547 F.2d at 616, the D.C. Circuit construed the provision

to mean that “exceptional circumstances exist” when an agency . . . is deluged with a volume of requests for information vastly in excess of that anticipated by Congress, when the existing resources are inadequate to deal with the volume of such requests within the time limits of subsection (6)(A), and when the agency can show that it “is exercising due diligence” in processing the requests.

See also *Exner v. Federal Bureau of Investigation*, 542 F.2d 1121 (9th Cir. 1976); *Gilmore v. National Sec. Agency*, No. C-92-3646 THE, 1993 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7694, at *34 (N.D. Cal. May 3, 1993) (*Exner* adopted a “limited version of the holding in *Open America* allow[ing] an agency to claim ‘exceptional circumstances’ where it is faced with an unforeseen and unforeseeable increase in the number of FOIA requests”).

The statute and relevant caselaw thus provide that standard, non-expedited requests must be processed within 20 days; that judicial supervision of the FOIA process is appropriate immediately upon the expiration of that time limit; and that an agency may be granted “additional time” only when it can show, *inter alia*, that it “is deluged with a volume of requests for information vastly in excess of that anticipated by Congress.” It defies logic to conclude, as ODNI would apparently have it, that a request entitled to *expedited* processing somehow imposes *less* of a burden on a recalcitrant agency. As the court found in *EPIC*,

Congress could not have intended to create the absurd situation wherein standard FOIA requests must be processed within twenty days (unless the agency can show that exceptional circumstances exist for a delay), yet expedited requests empower an agency to unilaterally decide to exceed the standard twenty-day period.

EPIC, 416 F.Supp.2d at 38.⁵ The court thus held that:

⁵ ODNI makes much of the fact that the legislative history indicates that Congress’ intent was “not to require that [expedited] requests be processed within . . . [a] specific period of time.” Def. Opp. at 10 (citation omitted). As the *EPIC* court noted, however, “[t]he legislative history of the amendments makes clear that, although Congress opted not to impose a specific deadline on agencies processing expedited requests, its intent was to ‘give the request priority for processing *more quickly than otherwise would occur*.’” *EPIC*, 416 F.Supp.2d at 38 (citation omitted; emphasis in original).

1 an agency that violates the twenty-day deadline applicable to standard FOIA
 2 requests presumptively also fails to process an expedited request “as soon as
 3 practicable.” That is, a *prima facie* showing of agency delay exists when an agency
 fails to process an expedited FOIA request within the time limit applicable to
 standard FOIA requests.

4 The presumption of agency delay raised by failing to respond to an
 5 expedited request within twenty days is certainly rebuttable if the agency presents
 credible evidence that disclosure within such time period is truly not practicable.

6 *Id.* at 39 (footnote omitted). *See also Gerstein I*, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 89883, at *9-*10 (this
 7 Court adopts *EPIC* analysis).

8 Here, ODNI does not even attempt to meet that burden.⁶ The agency merely asserts that “it
 9 is simply not practicable” to complete the processing of EFF’s requests (submitted on August 31,
 10 2007) prior to December 31, 2007. Def. Opp. at 13. In support of that assertion, the agency
 11 vaguely cites “the existence of classified materials, which . . . contributes significantly to the
 12 complexities attendant to processing a FOIA request,” and the routine fact that “documents subject
 13 to other exemptions . . . must similarly be identified and, where necessary, redacted, and
 14 documents generated by other agencies or authorities must be referred for review back to those
 15 same agencies or authorities.” *Id.* at 12 (citations omitted). The agency does not identify the
 16 number of employees it has assigned to process the requests, or provide the Court with any other
 17 specific information that might explain why it will require *four months* to process “approximately
 18 250 pages of unclassified material and approximately sixty-five pages of classified material”
 19 identified as responsive to the FOIA requests. *Id.* at 6.

20 ODNI’s position here is strikingly similar to DOJ’s in *EPIC*, where the court noted that the
 21 agency was “content to rest on its unsupported allegations that delay is necessary because *EPIC*’s
 22 requests are ‘broad’ and involve classified documents.” *EPIC*, 416 F. Supp. 2d at 40 (citation
 23 omitted). Finding that such “vague assertions, unsupported by credible evidence, are insufficient to
 24 demonstrate that further delay is currently necessitated,” the court noted that “courts often find that
 25 one to two months is sufficient time for an agency to process broad FOIA requests that may
 26

27 ⁶ While arguing that *EPIC* was “wrongly decided,” the agency does not even mention the “credible
 28 evidence” standard in its opposition, let alone explain why an agency should not be required to
 make such a showing.

involve classified or exempt material.” *Id.* (citations omitted).⁷

In *Gilmore*, this Court considered – and rejected – similar agency claims in the context of an *Open America* enlargement of processing time sought by the National Security Agency. In asserting “exceptional circumstances,” the agency claimed that “the highly complex and technical nature of the information dealt with by NSA, and the extreme sensitivity of much of that information necessarily delay the processing of FOIA requests.” *Gilmore*, 1993 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7694 at *36. Noting that “it does not appear that those are acceptable grounds for delay under FOIA,” the Court emphasized that “[n]o special exception [from the statutory time limits] was created for any agency, including the NSA and *other intelligence agencies that face its particular problems*.” *Id.* at *36-*37 (emphasis added).

Finally, we note that the Ninth Circuit has unequivocally held that agency “difficulties” of the kind ODNI cites here may not be invoked to justify FOIA processing delays:

Though FOIA doubtless poses practical difficulties for federal agencies, federal agencies can educate Congress on the practical problems they have, and attempt to persuade Congress to change the law or provide additional funds to achieve compliance. So long as the Freedom of Information Act is the law, we cannot repeal it by a construction that vitiates any practical utility it may have. . . . It may be that agency heads, such as the Attorney General in this case, can be forced by the Freedom of Information Act to divert staff from programs they think more valuable to Freedom of Information Act compliance But these policy concerns are legislative, not judicial, and we intimate no views on them. Congress wrote a tough statute on agency delay in FOIA compliance, and recently made it tougher.

Fiduccia v. Dep’t of Justice, 185 F.3d 1035, 1041 (9th Cir. 1999). The “tough statute” that Congress enacted clearly does not countenance a four-month delay in the processing of 315 pages of material responsive to “expedited” FOIA requests. ODNI is in violation of the law and has failed to demonstrate an entitlement to any more time than it has already had.

⁷ By no stretch of the imagination can EFF’s requests be characterized as “broad.” The *EPIC* court cited judicial orders requiring “agencies to process over 6000 pages of material within 60 days,” and “the ‘vast majority’ of the processing of 7500 pages to be completed within 32 days.” *Id.* (citations omitted). The 315 pages of responsive material at issue here pales in comparison.

III. EFF Will Suffer Irreparable Injury in the Absence of Preliminary Relief

As we noted in our opening memorandum, “[c]ourts have recognized that the requisite injury is present, and preliminary injunctive relief is appropriate, in cases [where] expedited FOIA processing is at issue and where time thus is of the essence, because delay ‘constitutes a cognizable harm.’” Motion for Preliminary Injunction (“Pl. Mot.”) at 14 (Dkt. No. 6), quoting *Gerstein I*, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 89883, at *15. We further noted that this Court and others have explicitly stated that the pendency of legislation related to the subject of a FOIA request weighs in favor of a grant of expedited processing. Pl. Mot. at 16; see *Gerstein v. CIA*, No. C-06-4643 MMC, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 89847, at *20 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 29, 2006) (“*Gerstein II*”) (granting expedited processing where court noted that “there is a significant recognized interest in enhancing public debate on potential legislative action”); see also *Leadership Conference on Civil Rights v. Gonzales*, 404 F.Supp.2d 246, 260 (D.D.C. 2005); *ACLU v. Dep’t of Justice*, 321 F.Supp.2d 24, 31 (D.D.C. 2004).

In the face of this clear authority, ODNI argues that EFF has failed to show the requisite injury because “at this stage plaintiff does not know, and certainly has not established, whether its request will produce any responsive, non-exempt documents that will contribute to th[e] debate” on the pending foreign intelligence surveillance legislation. Def. Opp. at 16. First of all, ODNI has now acknowledged that “[a]s a result of [its] comprehensive search and review process,” documents responsive to EFF’s requests “have been identified.” Def. Opp. at 6. As for the question of whether ODNI will ultimately disclose “non-exempt” material, even a decision to *withhold* all of the responsive documents would influence consideration of the pending legislation.

EFF seeks access to information “vital to the current and ongoing debate surrounding whether, and how, foreign intelligence surveillance law should be amended, especially with regard to providing legal immunity to telecommunications carriers for their past participation in unlawful government surveillance operations.” Declaration of Marcia Hofmann in Support of Motion for Preliminary Injunction (“Hofmann Decl.”), ¶ 19 (Dkt. 7). Key members of Congress have indicated that they are less likely to support a grant of such immunity if the Executive Branch refuses to disclose relevant information. For example, on May 21, 2007, Sens. Patrick J. Leahy and Arlen

1 Specter (Chairman and Ranking Member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, respectively) wrote to
 2 the Attorney General to reiterate the Committee's longstanding requests for various documents
 3 concerning foreign intelligence surveillance. Declaration of David Sobel, Exhibit A. The Senators
 4 noted that the Committee is considering legislation relating to surveillance activities, and that the
 5 requested information is "critical" to the legislative process:

6 [T]he Administration has offered a legislative proposal that it contends seeks to
 7 "modernize" the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA). As you know, the
 8 Judiciary Committee has historically overseen changes to FISA and it is this
 9 Committee's responsibility to review the Administration's proposal with great care.
 10 The draft legislation would make dramatic and far-reaching changes to a critical
 11 national security authority. *Before we can even begin to consider any such*
 12 *legislative proposal, we must be given appropriate access to the information*
 13 *necessary to carry out our oversight and legislative duties.*

14 *Id.* at 2 (emphasis added). More recently, on October 22, 2007, Sens. Leahy and Specter wrote to
 15 the Counsel to the President and reiterated their unwillingness "to consider immunity" if the
 16 Administration was not more forthcoming with relevant information.

17 If the Administration wants our support for immunity [from liability for
 18 communications carriers], it should comply with the [Committee's] subpoenas,
 19 provide the information, and justify its request. As we have both said, it is
 20 wrongheaded to ask Senators to consider immunity without their being informed
 21 about the legal justifications purportedly excusing the conduct being immunized.
 22 Although the two of us have been briefed on certain aspects of the President's
 23 program, this cannot substitute for access to the documents and legal analysis
 24 needed to inform the legislative decisions of the Committee as a whole.

25 Declaration of David Sobel, Exhibit B at 1. It is thus clear that a decision by ODNI to withhold the
 26 requested information while the legislation is still pending would, in and of itself, be a "meaningful
 27 [albeit perverse] contribution to the ongoing public debate," *Gerstein II*, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
 28 89847, at *21 (internal quotation marks omitted), and render some members of Congress less
 inclined to support a grant of immunity.

Finally, ODNI argues that "[e]ven with respect to any non-exempt documents that may be
 released [after Congress acts], plaintiff's ability to inform the public about the subject matter of its
 FOIA requests will not be precluded altogether, but merely postponed." Def. Opp. at 17. The
 government's assertion flies in the face of the rationale adopted by this Court in *Gerstein* and by
 other courts that have recognized that the value of requested information will diminish after a
 legislative debate has concluded. See, e.g., *Leadership Conference on Civil Rights v. Gonzales*,

404 F.Supp.2d 246, 260 (D.D.C. 2005) (“FOIA requests could have vital impact on development of the substantive record in favor of reauthorizing or making permanent the special provisions of the Voting Rights Act”); *ACLU v. Dep’t of Justice*, 321 F.Supp.2d at 30 (“a principle aim of plaintiff’s FOIA request is to provide information for the ongoing national debate about whether Congress should renew Section 215 and other Patriot Act surveillance provisions before they expire”). As the Ninth Circuit has recognized, “[t]he value of information is partly a function of time,” *Fiduccia*, 185 F.3d at 1041, and delay in the processing of FOIA requests “may well result in disclosing the relevant documents after the need for them in the formulation of national . . . policy has been overtaken by events.” *Natural Resources Defense Council v. Department of Energy*, 191 F. Supp. 2d 41, 43 (D.D.C. 2002).⁸ While ODNI blithely contends that the usefulness of the requested information will be “merely postponed” by further processing delays, the relevant precedent recognizes that its value will, in fact, be lost.⁹

⁸ Debate in Congress on immunity for telecommunications companies is ongoing and intense. Last week, Dow Jones reported that the “Senate Judiciary Committee Thursday deferred a vote on controversial legislation underpinning the government’s warrantless wiretapping program until next week. . . . Given that after next week, lawmakers retire for the Thanksgiving break, this could push a determination on the immunity issue until at least December.” Corey Boles and John Godfrey, *US Lawmakers Defer FISA Legislation Vote For A Week*, Dow Jones Newswires, November 8, 2007, available online at http://money.cnn.com/news/newsfeeds/articles/djf500/200711081241DOWJONESDJONLINE000975_FORTUNE5.htm.

On Thursday, November 15, 2007, the Senate Judiciary Committee held its mark-up session, and reported a bill without retroactive immunity, leaving that decision to the full Senate. Pamela Hess, *House OKs Surveillance Oversight Bill*, Associated Press, November 15, 2007, available online at <http://ap.google.com/article/ALeqM5hJKgeE0Z-SivATjok-utYBdh9wDwD8SUFI800>. On the same day, the House of Representatives passed the RESTORE Act, H. R. 3773. *Id.* Today, the Dow Jones Newswire reported the Senate plans to act on the FISA bill when it returns from the Thanksgiving break on December 3, as “one of the few measures the Senate deals with” in its two-week December session. See John Godfrey and Corey Boles, *US Senate To Take Up Wiretapping Bill In December - Aide*, Dow Jones Newswire, November 16, 2007, available online at http://money.cnn.com/news/newsfeeds/articles/djf500/200711161401DOWJONESDJONLINE000751_FORTUNE5.htm.

It is thus imperative that the requested documents are available to be part of this debate, and therefore ODNI’s proposed December 31, 2007 release date, Def. Opp. at 6, appears designed to keep the requested documents from contributing to the critical portion of the debate that will occur in November and December.

⁹ ODNI’s final argument is that issuance of a preliminary injunction would not serve the public interest because it “has the potential to complicate and disrupt the processing of other FOIA requests.” Def. Opp. at 19 (citation omitted). If, however, as the agency claims, EFF’s FOIA requests have been “moved to the front of the FOIA queue” and “are currently being processed ahead of [all other] pending FOIA requests,” *id.* at 5, it is difficult to understand how the hastened

CONCLUSION

When EFF submitted its FOIA requests to ODNI on August 31, 2007, it asserted that there was “an urgency to inform the public” about the requested information because “Congress will imminently consider modifying FISA” and such information “will help the public and Congress fully participate in the looming debate over whether the government’s authority to conduct electronic surveillance should be further expanded and facilitated by telecommunications companies.” Exhibits K & L (attached to Hofmann Decl.). ODNI granted EFF’s request for expediting processing, thus acknowledging the “urgency to inform the public” and the relevance of the requested information to the “looming debate” in Congress. With the legislative debate now underway, the agency asserts that it will be *four months* from the date of the requests – until December 31, 2007 – before it will be able to complete the processing of *315 pages* of material responsive to EFF’s “expedited” requests.

The need for injunctive relief is clear. For the reasons stated above, EFF respectfully requests that its motion for a preliminary injunction be granted.

DATED: November 16, 2007

By _____/s/
David L. Sobel (*pro hac vice*)
sobel@eff.org
ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION
1875 Connecticut Ave. NW
Suite 650
Washington, DC 20009
Tel: (202) 797-9009 x104/Fax: (202) 707-9066

Kurt Opsahl (SBN 191303)
kurt@eff.org
Marcia Hofmann (SBN 250087)
marcia@eff.org
ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION
454 Shotwell Street
San Francisco, CA 94110
Tel: (415) 436-9333 x116/Fax: (415) 436-9993

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION

completion of the processing of EFF’s requests would work to the detriment of other requesters. If anything, faster processing of EFF’s requests will allow the agency to return to the processing of the other pending requests more quickly.